DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 828 95 EA 007 416

AUTHOR Svenson, Elwin V.
TITLE Observations on Emerging Relationships between Regional Educational Laboratories and State Departments of Education.
INSTITUTION Central Midwestern Regional Educational Lab., St. Ann, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 69
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; Change Agents; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Federal State Relationship; Field Studies; Information Dissemination; *Interagency Cooperation; Questionnaires; *State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS *Regional Educational Laboratories

ABSTRACT

This study examines the emerging relationships between the Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs) created by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and various other educational agencies with which RELs work. A major purpose of the investigation was to identify those factors that encourage or obstruct the development of effective working relationships between RELs and other educational agencies. Information for the study was gathered through intensive discussions and interviews with principal persons associated with selected RELs and State Departments of Education. The interview schedule covered the spectrum of activities in certain areas of interest common to both RELs and State Departments of Education and allowed the research team to examine all stages of educational program development. In addition, available information in the files of the United States Office of Education was reviewed to trace the historical development of the REL program as it affected interagency relationships. A sample of the survey questionnaire is contained in the appendix. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED109828

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OBSERVATIONS ON EMERGING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

by

Elwin V. Svenson

Published by the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc. (CEMREL), a private non-profit corporation supported in part as a regional laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

EA 007 416

CEMREL, Inc.
10646 St. Charles Rock Road
St. Ann, Missouri 63074

October 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	i - ii
Methodology of Study	1 - 4
Findings	5 - 11
Conclusions	12 - 16
Recommendations	17 - 18
Appendix A	19 - 40
Appendix B	41 - 46

INTRODUCTION

In the United States the legal responsibility for education at its several levels is vested in the fifty states. Operational responsibility for education is delegated to more than twenty-five thousand local educational agencies. Teacher training, educational research and the other vital functions are performed by the nation's colleges and universities, which number more than twenty-two hundred.

The successful role of the federal government in any aspect of education, other than as a funds distributor or a statistics gatherer and analyst, is entirely dependent upon the willingness of the various political and operational elements of the educational systems to cooperate voluntarily. The burden of seeking such participation and developing the spirit of cooperation rests upon the federal agency.

Under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a new network of educational institutions was created--The Regional Educational Laboratories. These laboratories were charged with the responsibility of bringing into alliance research interests, legally responsible elements and operationally responsible subdivisions to provide research and development and the dissemination and implementation of research-based innovations and findings.

The purpose of this study is to identify the nature of the emerging relationships which have developed, or are in the process of developing, between selected regional laboratories and other selected educational agencies and through this sampling to identify the nature, quality and prognosis of such relationships in the program as a whole.

An increasing understanding of the developing relationships can be used to identify ways to foster and maintain communication about developments which is so essential in the successful accomplishment of REL goals.

Another concern was to identify those factors which militated against the development and emergence of the possible relationships as well as those forces which were constructive in this respect.

The information in this study was gathered through intensive discussions and interviews with principal persons associated with selected Regional Educational Laboratories and some of the State Departments of Education. To accomplish this research study, an interview schedule was prepared which covered the spectrum of activities in certain areas common to both laboratories and state departments. The interview enabled the research team to touch on all aspects of educational program development from problem identification to ultimate feedback of data from classroom implementation of educational products.

Concurrently, with the development of the interview schedule, a review was made of the information available in the files of the United States Office of Education to trace the historical development of the laboratory program with particular reference to documents dealing with the issue of "Relationships." (See Appendix B)

The study is reported under the following topics:

Methodology of Study
Findings
Conclusions
Recommendations
Appendix A: A Review of Regional Educational Laboratories
Appendix B: Case Study of Emerging Relationships Between Selected Regional Educational Laboratories and Related State Educational Agencies; and Interview Schedule

METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

General Procedure

The method of this study was partially determined by the Scope of Work written by the Division of Educational Laboratories to define contractual expectations. Relevant portions appear below.

Plan of Work

1. The Laboratory Branch will inform laboratories by June 15, 1969, of the purpose of the study.

2. The Contractor will contact selected laboratories that appear to have relationships with state educational agencies that would provide a basis for a constructive case study. The Division of Educational Laboratories and the Contractor in discussion with the laboratories will decide on the case studies to be made.

3. The Contractor will plan in detail the content of the study and the schedule for its accomplishment.

4. Site visits will be made to each of the laboratories and selected agencies in their regions to collect data for the case studies.

Within this framework, it was decided that case studies would be made of the relationships between five regional laboratories and the state education departments of their regions. A total of 11 man-days was spent in visiting the laboratories and 26 man-days in visiting personnel in state departments. Sixty-seven interviews were conducted.

An Interview Schedule was developed and each site visitor provided with a copy of the instrument, included as Appendix B. The section on study group organization presents the roster of consultants who served as interviewers.

Design

As an examination of the instrument will reveal, its intent was to probe the perceptions of the interviewees regarding the locus of responsibility for different phases of the research, development, dissemination spectrum; the interviewee was asked to identify which agency has responsibility for various actions, and which agency should have the responsibility. The interviewee was also encouraged to respond freely to the questions to enable the interviewer to understand the context in which the response was made and whether the terminology used in the initial question had the same meaning to the respondent as to the questioner and to other respondents.

In most instances, laboratory personnel were interviewed first; related state department people next. Two varieties of the basic approach were used. In

one case, two different interviewers were assigned to one region, one to interview the laboratory, the other the state department. In another case, two interviewers interrogated two principals of the same laboratory. No apparent differences appeared as a result of these variations.

A dual approach was used in the preliminary analysis of the data. First, a computation was made of the frequency of each response to the various questions. Second, a categorization was made of the amplified comments related to each question. For example, in answer to the first question,

> "From your point of view, as a member of a state department of education, who has the responsibility for identifying the critical problems of education in your state?"

a reply of "It is our responsibility" is so tabulated. However, in verbal discussion afterward it frequently developed that the respondent had not recently identified "critical problems," that he was unaware of other agencies' activities, or that he may have been speaking of legal responsibility rather than an operating or functional responsibility. Such answers were also characterized, and conclusions were drawn from the combination of these data.

Factors which became apparent through the use of the interview include the following:

1. Responses were limited by the respondents' not being adequately informed about developmental activities conducted by others;

2. The instrument was broad-gauged in subject while many of the respondents were associated with specific, more narrow fields and responded according to their association;

3. The meaning of some questions was not clear to some interviewees;

4. Words used in the instrument (e.g., "critical problems," "development") had different meanings to different people; and

5. Some interviewees were defensive, others impatient and still others overly expansive in responding to the questions.

Despite these difficulties, the interview procedure led in numerous cases to free and frank discussion which was both invaluable in later interpretation and useful for the parties involved.

The central office for the study was established at the University of California, Los Angeles, so as to be convenient for the day-to-day planning and direction of the Principal Investigator.

An initial meeting was held on July 14, 1969, for the purpose of formulating the study plan and establishing a schedule for its accomplishment.

In early September, several interviewers and other project personnel met in Washington, D.C., with the Chief of the Division of Educational Laboratories Branch to discuss the impressions gathered as a result of the visits, to review preliminary findings emerging from the data analysis, to determine the most accurate format for presentation of the findings and to review the time schedule. As necessary, modifications were later made on the basis of the final data analysis, and preparation of the report of the study was completed.

Interviewer orientation and initial interviews were conducted. The Principal Investigator reviewed the data and determined that it was not feasible to obtain useful or valid data on funds or in-kind services provided by the various activities. This was caused by the general lack of information on that subject by the interviewees as well as by its fundamental complexity. This class of data does not lend itself to being obtained in an understandable form in discussions with key executive personnel.

Activity Selection Criteria

It appeared to be appropriate to insure a selection within the sample of laboratories and state departments which would include the following characteristics:

1. Laboratories which had the active participation of some or all of the related state departments in their establishment;

2. Laboratories which had less active or nominal participation of the related state departments in their establishment;

3. Laboratories where regional boundaries essentially are state boundaries so that only one laboratory contacts those state departments;

4. Regions where two (or more) laboratories actively serve the same state;

5. Insurance that there is some balance between rural/urban concerns; and

6. Representation of both populous and less populous states.

Study Group Organization

A group, organized under the direction of the Principal Investigator, met on July 14, 1969, to review and formulate the criteria for selection of the laboratories to be surveyed and to develop the questions to be asked and the technique required for data acquisition.

Five interviewers were selected from a listing of available persons knowledgeable of laboratory activity and presently working in the field of

education. An 8-hour training program was conducted to orient the interviewers to the objectives and structure of the project and to introduce them to the interview procedure and instruments. The interviewers were then assigned to the selected activities on the basis of each interviewer's availability and familiarity with the region involved.

The consultants who participated in either the study formulation or the interviews or both are as follows:

Keith Acheson	Ed.D.	Associate Professor of Education University of Oregon
Richard Davis	Ph.D.	Dean, School of Education University of Wisconsin
Richard Longaker	Ph.D.	Professor of Political Science University of California at Los Angeles
Judith Silverman	M.A.	Staff Writer
Garth Sorenson	Ph.D.	Professor of Education University of California at Los Angeles
Elwin V. Svenson	Ed.D.	Principal Investigator Coordinator of Overseas Programs University of California at Los Angeles

FINDINGS

The interview instrument* covered fourteen basic questions along the time-length spectrum of product development from problem identification to ultimate classroom data feedback on educational accomplishments.

Comparative answers to certain of these questions are included in this section to highlight the communication difficulties inherent in the attempt to create and maintain helpful relationships between state departments and regional laboratories. The differences in priorities is paramount with a high degree of focus by state departments on operational problems while the laboratories appear to take a "global" view.

The opinions and comments attributed to "state departments" and "laboratories" are and should be recognized as the opinions and statements of individuals in those activities and may not be the composite opinion of the majority working in that organization, or indeed of its management. In some cases it may be the wrong answer to the wrong question propounded to the wrong individual by the wrong interviewer. Nonetheless, these are the sorts of opinions expressed.

1. *From your point of view what are the critical educational problems in this state?*

State department replies:

- Develop a viable method of determining needs
- Develop a system of evaluation of what we are doing to and for kids
- Develop cost effectiveness methods
- Training educators to become more aware of why they are doing what they do
- Develop methods of involving parents and children in education
- Develop behavior modification strategies
- Inability of schools to provide relevant curricula
- The fluctuating value system of society
- Need to accelerate educational leadership development
- Develop models to determine outstanding achievement
- Identify role of state department to other state agencies
- Finance is a major problem
- Development of intercultural programs
- Define what compensatory education really is
- The ignoring of the state department in initial educational decisions
- Develop better ways of individualizing instruction and performance goals
- Define the role of education in society as a force for good
- Inadequate teacher training and preparation

---

*A copy of the interview Questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Find methods to reduce the rigidity of the system
Improve teacher education and certification standards
Migrant aid, minority education
Finance
Strong local vested interests
Need for applied research
Conflict with public on things like sex education
Need to incorporate parochial schools
Improve instruction of primary school children in basic skills
Provide instruction for non-college bound children
Improve education to physically handicapped, e.g., deaf, blind
Improve preparation of teachers and administrators
Develop methods for identifying problems
Improve teacher competency
Need to individualize education
Develop more effective human relations in education
Need standards of discipline
Archaic educational system tied to school books
No effective dissemination of knowledge of new methods
Need for systematic pre-service and in-service teacher training
Conservative political climate
Attraction and retention of qualified educators and administrators

What are critical educational problems in your region?

Laboratory reply:

Lack of ability of educational establishment to do long-range planning
State departments of education are substantially ineffective in many roles in which they see themselves as principals
The loss of confidence by the citizenry (taxpayer) in the effectiveness of the current school system and the corollary need for cost-effectiveness implementations
Lack of sufficient numbers of creative, imaginative, energetic people in the classroom and administration to maintain the pace of growth and development that is required
Parochialism on the part of school people who are bogged down in what they see as trivia and have become self-pitying and discouraged
The critical problem throughout the country is the rigid curriculum administered by people who should be paid less and taught by teachers who should be paid more
The urgent necessity to improve materials and training in early childhood work
Too much emphasis placed on the disadvantaged, not enough on fully developing the average and gifted child
The overall lack of achievement
The "fringe American" - the black and brown people
Lack of agreement amoung educators as to what the educational "outcome" should be
Lack of data to support that what is claimed to be done in schools is really being done

Treating educational problems from a cost-effectiveness standpoint
"Change for change's sake" obscures the basic purposes of improving education
Establishing method of using Title IV developments under Title III
Lack of delineation of problems and no establishment of priorities
General perception of authority and responsibility rather than accountability and performance

2. *Once the critical problems facing education in your state have been identified, who has the responsibility for establishing priorities, for actually committing money, personnel and other resources and for initiating work on the problem?*

Each state department and laboratory interviewed agreed that the establishment of priorities was and should be a shared activity.

The state departments see such sharing as being with the following:

1. State legislatures, since certain funds are available to accomplish certain prescribed goals, and some Federal agencies (where funds are provided for specific purposes);

2. Local school boards, since they are influential in local and state political matters involving funds; and

3. Classroom teachers, since (by truth or mythology) they have the close-up, clear eyed, problem/solution capability.

It should be noted that no state department identified any laboratory as having, or being an agency which should have, priority-establishing capability or authority.

The laboratories see such sharing as being between the lab and the following:

1. State department to the extent that that particular problem is relevant to that state; and

2. A given school system or district if it is to be involved in the development and/or testing process.

It should be noted that laboratories accept the joint responsibility concept much more firmly in the abstract than in the operational mode. Inherent to the entire aspect of the subject is the attitude generally found that if the laboratory is speaking of its own program, project or product it invites a good deal of sharing, usually on its own terms. A fairly paternalistic attitude is apparently not unknown.

The general subject of priority implementation shows the broadest differences among the various state departments ranging all the way from permitting and encouraging local autonomy to a highly restrictive and fairly authoritarian retention at the state department level. One state department includes almost every activity in the state in the priority identification problem ranging

from the legislature and universities through district and local authorities and leaders.

3. *Who does or should do the feasibility testing of existing alternatives in the development cycle?*

This question was answered by state departments about equally divided between sharing the responsibility and believing that this responsibility was the function of product developers regardless of type of organization. Several interviewees who believed that others should perform this task gave as reasons for this the lack of funds and current lack of personnel to do this work. The laboratories were identified as one of the competent types of organizations who could and should do this work.

In the reply to this question the concept was repeatedly evidenced that state departments look upon laboratories as highly competent resources and service organizations.

The laboratories consistently stated a pragmatic operational view in that "whoever" is undertaking the problem's solution should be the one to become knowledgeable of what has been and is being done in that particular area of education. In practical application the laboratories look upon this activity as being, in their case, their responsibility.

4. *Who has responsibility for development of specifications for any new product or program? Who should have?*

The state departments uniformly believe this is and should be a shared responsibility. However, in conversations that ensued, interviewers found that "sharing" as used by state department personnel generally meant they would seek input from classroom teachers, teachers' associations, school districts and relevant other levels in education. At the same time, the majority of state departments indicated they do not have the personnel or funds to undertake such responsibility. Several interviewees alluded to the laboratories as a source for such assistance, again demonstrating their view of the laboratories as a service resource.

The laboratories unequivocally identify the responsibility for development of specifications for a program or product as being theirs if they have the subsequent responsibility for product development. Indeed, this function is looked upon by the laboratories as being central to the success of any effort they might make.

There was much semantic difficulty in understanding just what "specifications" meant ranging all the way from fairly gross description on the part of some state departments to finely structured detailed objectives broken down by short time increments as seen by some laboratories.

5. *Who has the responsibility for planning a system for effective dissemination? Who should be responsible?*

State departments were unanimous in the opinion that this was a shared function. Further discussion developed the fact that no two state departments saw the

same organizations involved. Some saw it a relationship between the developer and the local user, some saw the state department and the local school district and some (apparently referring to current practice) considered it to be between the publisher and the curricula selection organization with input from local users.

It should be noted that except in the role of developer or publisher the regional laboratory was not considered as having any role.

The regional laboratories also consider it to be a shared responsibility and generally describe a relationship involving state departments, teacher training institutions, developers and local school districts and users. This particular function is seen as a very vital part of the educational improvement equation by the laboratories, but they see only a limited role except where they are the developers.

6. *Who is or should be responsible for establishing preliminary plans for feedback and impact studies?*

Nothing in the interview was more illustrative of the urgent need for laboratories to involve specific state departments in the earliest stages of problem identification and project planning. The structural differences among the state departments compounded by the broad differences in their individual relationships with their school districts would tend to make any "standard" plans for feedback and impact studies largely unworkable. It appears that a developer needs to have fairly clear identification of where and with whom the program or product will be tested and to design the feedback system and impact studies element of the program to be feasible within the capabilities existing where it will be used.

The general impression is gained from the interviews that presently such aspects of product development as feedback and impact studies are not given high priority and except in two cases state departments do not have a working mechanism with which to participate in these activities.

The laboratories (looking to the future, since none interviewed have proceeded programmatically to the point of preparing such plans) all indicate that, for program and products of which they are the developers, this planning and implementation is their responsibility.

7. *Who has and who should have the responsibility for developing new products?*

This was, perhaps, the most imperfectly asked question. The broad range of replies varied from interpreting the "who" to be the person with the pen all the way to the *ad hoc* committee which would conceptualize the philosophical and technical basis on which the product would be developed. Most state departments indicated that they either now have or should have the responsibility. Discussion seemed to indicate that in carrying out the responsibility a reliance is placed on universities, commercial publishers and local school level activities. Each state department indicated an interest in the development cycle and was interested in being kept informed of activities and progress not directly under surveillance of the department.

Regional laboratories believe the function should be shared and on projects or programs in which they are involved believe that close liaison with classroom teachers, local districts and state departments has a high degree of importance both as to the success of the development as well as the diffusion and utilization aspect.

8. *Who is or should be responsible for the test revision cycle on new products?*

9. *Who is or should be responsible for developing a plan for teacher training?*

State departments indicated that both of these responsibilities are and should be carried out by developers of products. Several interviewees expressed doubt as to the adequacy of the way in which these functions are now being done particularly with respect to commercial sources. Some indicated that sufficient evidence had to be presented that these requirements had been fulfilled prior to state adoption but nonetheless expressed concern as to the sophistication in the performance of these tasks.

Laboratories, initially identifying themselves as the developer, were unanimous in the opinion that the developer must include these functions as an integral part of his development scheme. Some doubt was expressed as to the workability of these plans unless there is early involvement of specific state departments and if possible early identification of school districts or classrooms with which they will be working.

10. *Who has or should have the responsibility for putting the teacher training plans developed in step 9 into action?*

The question concerning teacher training was discussed by the state departments on a variety of levels. Initially they associated themselves closely with teacher training. Further inquiry developed that with the recent unfusion of federal funds, in-service teacher training is in general use for purposes of upgrading teacher skills and abilities in general and for introducing new material and curricula adopted by the department for use within the state.

When the question was rephrased to bring out emphasis on the role the state department considers it has with respect to teacher training aspects of programs and products in the process of development and authentication, there appeared to be a reluctance to commit financial or human resources to that function. Rather, the discussion developed the view that district and local officials and classroom teachers had primary interest and motivation. The departments indicated that their gatekeeper function required that they be informed of such in-service training. Only one department contended that the in-service teacher training function was and should be theirs regardless of the origin or state of completion of the product.

Laboratories saw the responsibility as being shared with heavy emphasis on state departments and teacher training institutions.

11. *Who has and who should have responsibility for informing potential users at various levels of the availability of the product?*

Both state departments and laboratories identify the principal responsibility for this information/promotion/sales effort as falling to the developer and appear to agree that this is a satisfactory and effective method. Discussion developed the opinion that this method is highly inefficient but the necessity for a "sales/demonstration" factor could not be ignored. When queried on other methods and techniques of diffusing and distributing products, the general opinion appeared to be that "diffusion strategies should be developed." Laboratories considered that factor to be of significant importance, but no methods have crystallized beyond the planning stage at this time.

12. *Who has or should have responsibility of getting the product into use and into the hands of teachers on the job and insuring they actually use it?*

State departments consider that they have a limited overseeing role in this respect, but that local school authorities have and should have the basic monitoring responsibility. State departments indicate a relatively high degree of confidence in the systems presently in effect which permit local superintendents to know what is going on in the classroom.

Laboratories generally concur that they have no substantial role in this matter but believe that, in addition to present local monitoring, the state departments should undertake the development of more sophisticated information systems so as to be more aware of local activities and progress.

13. *Who has or should have the responsibility for feedback and evaluation of use of the product?*

Some state department opinions indicated that the responsibility is and should be that of the developer and user. Some, however, felt that such feedback and evaluation should be handled by the state department. None indicated that they had such capability, but some thought either a new division could be established or the work could be contracted out to consultants or competent organizations.

Laboratories believe they have a continuing role through local users in participating in the evaluation process of their developments so that programs and products can continue to be improved. Some laboratories see themselves as available, perhaps on a contract basis, to perform evaluations with respect to material, programs and products they did not develop.

CONCLUSIONS

1. State departments have indicated unequivocally their feeling that they wish to be involved in the identification of the critical educational problems of their state. Whereas the preponderance of state department respondents felt that the responsibility was theirs or theirs shared with others, most laboratory personnel viewed the responsibility as a shared one, not as theirs alone.

2. Generally, state departments do not claim responsibility for research and development activities to meet identified educational needs. Although they do not cast themselves in the role of product developers, the state departments included in the study did indicate a desire to participate in the development of product specifications with either their own personnel or consultants of their choice. Lack of appropriate talent and funds and the full-time performance of other regulatory and administrative duties which might be incompatible with the R&D process are given as reasons for their present limited participation in this activity.

3. State departments feel that they have a legitimate and important role in the process of dissemination and wish to assume such a role *vis a vis* the laboratories. With only one exception, the state departments surveyed expressed strong feelings about the responsibility to exercise control over whether products will be disseminated on a widespread basis. While state departments claim the gatekeeper role of product approval, the majority do not, on the other hand, assume the responsibility for insuring the use of a new product once it is available, deferring to local school districts and teachers.

4. On the basis of findings 1, 2, and 3 above, and on the basis of conversations between interviewers and state department interviewees, it seems evident that state departments will be most likely to assist laboratories in widespread product installation if they have been involved in the laboratory effort prior to the conclusion of its developmental phase. Similarly, laboratories which wait to seek state department assistance or cooperation until they are ready for product installation may find that such cooperation will not be forthcoming at that late date.

5. The establishment of working relationships with state departments is a necessary first step but in itself is not sufficient to assure state adoption of laboratory products. This conclusion is based upon state department personnel's perceptions as well as upon difficulties experienced in the adoption process, though there are also examples of innovations which have been disseminated without state department involvement. In spite of these exceptions one must conclude that if a mode of effective, efficient and speedy dissemination of laboratory products to any sizeable and meaningful portion of the nation's schools is to be accomplished, the aggressive support and cooperation of the various state departments are needed to facilitate this process.

6. State departments differ in their feeling about the usefulness of the laboratories to them. In part, this feeling may be due to insensitivity of some laboratory personnel to the needs of the state departments and schools regarding matters of timing and implementation. In part, the feeling may be due to poor communication from laboratories to state departments as evidenced by the fact that, with exceptions in certain areas, state departments are not well informed about laboratory activities.

   Regarding communication, it should be recognized that laboratories' R&D orientation creates semantic problems insofar as descriptions of their activities may obscure for state department personnel the recognition that these activities will be genuinely useful to the schools. Furthermore, given the problem of semantic reconciliation between the "critical educational problems" which the state departments identified (see pages 5-7) and the ongoing laboratory programs, it is important to point out that many of the needs which state departments mention <u>are</u> in fact the subject of some program within the laboratory network but are not seen by state departments in their own terms or context. Also, some problems which state departments identify are not problems appropriate or amenable to solution by laboratory R&D efforts.

7. Poor communication between laboratories and state departments indicates, among other things, that state department representation on boards of directors is not the complete mechanism by which to insure information flow or effective liaison with state departments. It is equally valid to ponder the larger question of whether the current boards of directors, with their "mix" of membership from other agencies, are indeed functioning, as was initially hoped and anticipated, as conveyors of information to their colleagues and home institutions.

8. A few comments by state department interviewees indicated a basic communication difficulty between the state departments and the laboratories as a probable cause of relationships which are less than ideal. Since not all state department personnel had the same understanding of the research and development concepts being explored by the laboratory or of the language used, it can be assumed that general attitudes toward the laboratories are a function of the sensitivity of the laboratories to these facts. Clearly, mutual education, discussions and understanding must occur to facilitate the formation of the required cooperative and supportive relationship.

9. In the great number of instances in which positive feelings were expressed by a laboratory and a state department about the nature of their relationship, there appeared to be two common elements:

   First, the state department had been deeply involved in laboratory program planning; and

   Second, there was continuing contact at the program level.

It can be thus concluded that it is not sufficient for one individual at the state department level to be casually responsible for liaison

regarding all laboratory programs, but rather a one-to-one relationship between relevant laboratory and state department personnel seems to be necessary.

Though each interview was supportive of the need for the laboratories to be "independent," "objective" and "not lost in state department machinery," it apparently does not follow that such abstract support for such separate research and development capability insures a close interacting relationship automatically occurring. If such a relationship is to be developed so that benefits will ultimately accrue to the state departments, the local agencies and the school children, a planned campaign by the laboratories to achieve a relationship of cooperative, mutually helpful confidence is mandatory.

What are the characteristics of each type of relationship that has emerged between REL and the state departments of education?

The most apparent fact that emerged from the study is that there are significant differences between each laboratory and each state department it contacts as well as the type of relationship that is established. These differences appear to cover the spectrum of possible relationships.

The relationships which are identified range as follows:

(a) A close, mutually trustful cooperative approach with many planned and unplanned meetings at many levels within the two formal organizations;

(b) A respectful, somewhat formal approach with professional attitudes, planned meetings well attended and some contacts between some levels of the two organizations;

(c) A totally formal approach with strong elements of suspicion by each organization that the reference points of the other group are not focused on the relevant problems. The few contacts are limited to board meetings or occasional conferences. Opinions at any level suggest a general feeling by each group that the other organization can not (as a matter of capability) or will not (as a matter of established priorities and interests) cooperate effectively;

(d) Overt or covert hostility because of personality conflicts or a perception of threat or fundamental disagreements on basic principles; and

(e) Ignoring each other.

The order in which the spectrum is displayed should not necessarily be interpreted to be the scale between "good" and "bad" relationships. Each of the possible approaches was noted to exist, with various gradations and degrees between them being evidenced. Usually, upon closer examination there were valid reasons for the differences. Primarily, the breadth and depth and number of educational problems in each region are great. Relatively

new laboratories with limited resources necessarily established priorities as a first step in their operation as to the areas and problems they would undertake. Even assuming that these were in all cases wisely done, it is not surprising that all state departments in a region did not have coinciding appraisals of the relative importance of their problems. Secondarily, not all laboratories have developed effective communication with their state departments to fully explain their charter, their programs and their accomplishments.

It requires desire as well as talent to avoid on the one hand the disaster of being ignored, so that the ultimate product of the laboratory goes unused and unnoted, and on the other hand creating an unwanted dependency arrangement in which the research and development effort is governed by the interests and problems encountered in a single state department.

Under item (a), the "close mutually trustful relationship," the detractive quality was found to be an apparent pre-emption of the resources of the laboratory for programs of primary interest to one state department to the detriment of the interests of the other state departments in the region. While recognizing the maximized benefit that accrues to the one highly involved state department and to that laboratory as a result of the close relationship, recognition should also be given to the difficulties that exist in maintaining a close relationship with more than one state department.

The majority of laboratories have relationships with the state departments in their regions which range between (b) and (c). In many cases the approach appears to be a function of the coinciding interests in a common subject with a high degree of cooperation at points of overlap but with little or no contact in other aspects of the laboratories' efforts.

A factor which must be recognized and which may be of major significance in the entire "relationship" question is the variation in the structure, organization, size and charter of the different state departments. Further, even in cases where there appear to be substantial similarities in the way state departments are organized, they differ in their interpretations of their responsibilities and in their willingness to change their perceptions of the role of the state department in the educational system of their state.

The "suspicion" factor shown in approach (c) is more noted in relationships of primarily rural oriented states with their regional laboratory. While the apparent reason is the innate conservatism to be predicted in rural areas in the form of both political conservatism and educational traditionalism, the genuine reason might well be an insensitivity on the part of the laboratories in their dealings with educational colleagues whose primary concerns are focused on daily operational problems. Many problems seen as critical by rural oriented educators do not represent the types of effort that are or should be undertaken by the laboratories with their current resources.

With respect to approach (d) the fact that under certain circumstances hostility is the common emotion should not be a surprising fact. The clash

of battle within the educational community is still to be heard on basic issues, so when it is noted that a state department is on the opposite side from the laboratories the only helpful recommendation that can be made is that additional time and resources be committed to work on the problems that are identified by such conflicts.

The last category of "ignoring each other" is the result of many factors. In some cases it stems from inadequate or ineffective methods that have been used to get acquainted. Originally, the boards of directors were seen as a great force for cohesion, since the state departments were included in those memberships. In some cases the result has been less than was anticipated both because of lack of attendance (or attendance of alternates) at board meetings as well as non-transmittal of board meeting reports to state department personnel. Another cause of "ignoring" may be in the excessive dependency on mail communication via brochures, newsletters and other flyers. Some of them are not well done and their distribution does not insure that they get to the interested individuals in the state departments. The third cause of this phenomenon is an originally unrealistic expectation level of some state departments who now comment on "unconscionable slowness in laboratory completion of end products."

Though great effort will be required to initially establish or to reestablish a high feeling of confidence that the laboratories are of value to these reluctant state departments, the long-term success of the laboratories depends upon the creation of a working relationship other than just ignoring each other or maintaining an armed truce, where this situation occurs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As a prerequisite to establishing a healthy relationship, the state department must perceive the laboratory as being useful and relevant to the educational needs of the state department and the schools and children it serves. Almost none of the state departments look to laboratories outside their region for potential tie-ins. A fundamental structural error of the current situation is that state departments view the laboratories regionally, while in fact a laboratory anywhere in the country should be viewed as a national resource and potentially valuable to any state department.

   Clearly, a much more effective national information, dissemination and diffusion strategy must be developed. Such a strategy should enable state departments to have access to laboratory products throughout the laboratory system and would enable laboratories to provide their products to the widest possible group of potential users. The very process of developing and implementing such a strategy could strengthen the working relationships between the laboratories and the states and could be an especially valuable educational experience for those states which have had little experience or familarity with educational R&D.

2. The development of a national diffusion strategy should involve the joint efforts of laboratories, state education agencies and the U.S. Office of Education. Given the current status of laboratory funding, it is not realistic to expect more than token support for this activity to come from current laboratory budgets. If the USOE is dedicated to effective diffusion, then funds must be made available to support a cooperative development enterprise among the Office, the laboratories and the states.

3. Another mechanism to facilitate communication and cooperative relationships would be the creation of a jointly selected individual to fill a position funded through laboratory budgets in each state department, whose primary purpose would be continuing liaison between the state and the laboratories. The cost of this approach might approximate $1 million. In general, the mechanism would serve to create awareness and to successfully institutionalize cooperative efforts. Variations among state departments and among laboratories would necessarily require the adjustment of the principle to each situation, careful anticipation of opportunities and difficulties, and recognition of the possibility that in a given state such an appointment might not be fully effective. It is recommended that the Office of Education consider the possibility of making funds available to test this approach.

4. Although the intent of these recommendations is the strengthening of relationships between laboratories and state departments, it may be overoptimistic to assume that these relationships will mature and that laboratories can be expected to relate effectively to educational agencies throughout the nation when they have not even developed mechanisms to coordinate programs efficiently with one another. Although brilliant instances can be cited of laboratory cooperating with laboratory, and

although steps are being taken for the establishment of information exchange and coordination procedures for the full network, it does not seem likely that funds presently available to the individual laboratories can support the necessary effort. It is recommended that funds be made available by the Office of Education to support an adequate coordination effort among the regional laboratories at the program level.

5. Though there is a requirement in each contract scope of work to "develop relationships," funds have not flowed to laboratories on the basis of their success in establishing cooperative relationships with other educational agencies but rather on the basis of the promise of a limited number of developmental programs in which the laboratory was engaged. If the Office of Education now deems that "relationship" is an important criterion of laboratory promise or success, and if success or failure in this area will affect laboratories' annual operating funds, this judgment should be stated unequivocally, and the complete criteria for future laboratory evaluations and subsequent funding decisions should be made clear and explicit.

6. Information subsequent to completion of this study indicates that the very process of focusing on questions such as those raised in the interviews created the basis for clarification of many issues that had not been adequately identified, explored or resolved between the reporting laboratories and their state departments.

   It is strongly recommended that each laboratory continue via an interview process with relevant state department personnel to identify and clarify issues, capabilities and activities of interest to both.

APPENDIX A

A REVIEW OF REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES

On April 11, 1965, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was enacted into law. Under the authority of Title IV of that Act, a new group of institutions was launched on the American educational scene. Despite the fact that the American educational 'system' was already rich in institutions, agencies, associations and groups with responsibilities for assorted aspects of the country's educational enterprise, the laboratories, nevertheless, were created and developed.

An examination of the statutory origins and the legislative history, as well as the actions and documentation prepared by the program's early administrators, identifies and clarifies the need for the creation of the regional laboratories as independent organizations devoted to educational research and development. Inherent in this concept was a recognition that relationships with state departments of education and other educational groups would develop. Though all parties to the creation of the laboratories predicted that productive relationships would emerge, the exact nature of these could not be anticipated with a high degree of confidence.

The primary purpose of the present study was to discern the nature of the emerging relationships between selected regional laboratories and selected state departments of education and, through this sampling, to come to some conclusions about the nature and quality of such relationships in the program as a whole. More specifically, the objectives stated in the scope of work were:

1. To provide data on the characteristics of each of the types of relationships that have emerged between selected laboratories and selected state and local educational agencies in their region;

2. To estimate the number and kinds of relationships and the amounts of funds and costs of services-in-kind provided by the various parties;

3. To analyze the conditions that have affected the formation and promise of the various relationships that have developed; and

4. To discuss implications for the future of the laboratory program that might be drawn from the experience of these laboratories.

To accomplish these objectives, a case study approach was used.

This study is not the first attempt to describe the relationships between regional laboratories and other agencies. In the summer of 1967, Dr. Leon P. Minear, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of Oregon, conducted a survey at the request of Congresswoman Edith Green to probe the laboratories' relationships with state departments of education. Responding

to Dr. Minear's questionnaire, three Chief State School Officers reported that they felt that the laboratories competed with the work of local school districts; nine felt that the laboratories competed with the work of state departments of education; and nine felt that the laboratories competed with the work of colleges and universities. The majority, however, disagreed. Thirty-five Chief State School Officers felt that the laboratories complemented or supplemented the work of local school districts; 31 felt that the laboratories complemented or supplemented the work of state education departments, and 32 felt that laboratories complemented or supplemented the work of colleges and universities. To another question, 10 of the chief officials reported that their departments were "highly" involved in the development work of their laboratories' programs; 17 were "moderately" involved; 16 were involved "very little" and two were not at all involved. Less than one-fifth (9 out of 47) of the chief officials felt that the laboratories were in competition with their state departments.

Finally, the respondents to Dr. Minear's study were asked to "list the functions that regional areas have identified for their regional educational laboratories which state departments of education could not perform if they were given additional funds." The summary of responses (October, 1967) states:

> "24 Chief State School Officers said 'None' or listed none. Eleven said that departments could not operate as well across state lines to meet regional needs. Two pointed out that interstate work by contract arrangement is possible but not as likely to be carried out if left up to individual states. Four respondents indicated that departments could not do as sophisticated a job of basic and applied research as labs, even if the departments did have the funds. Six respondents said that the freedom labs have from the unique historical and statutory functions associated with departments of education make them more capable of effective research and development activities than departments would be even if they had the funds."

Two years have passed since the Minear study, and in that time period relationships with state and local educational agencies have developed in various ways and with varying degrees of complexity and effectiveness. The concept that the laboratories should have cooperative arrangements with other educational groups was always seen as the most effective technique of maximizing the benefit of the research and development expected from the laboratories. In fact, the individual who participated in launching the laboratories had high expectations for the role the laboratories would play in creating new and productive interactions among educational interests.

The need for new interactions and relationships was clear, because by 1965 USOE's primary educational research support program, Cooperative Research, had been funding extramural research for more than eight years but had produced little discernible change in operating educational programs. A paper written in 1967 by two Bureau of Research officials[1] spelled out the deficiencies of the then prevailing Cooperative Research approach:

> "It became apparent that individual research projects as a whole, while of acceptable levels of quality individually, did not fit

together well enough to be considered coordinated approaches to substantive problems in education....Second, part of the difficulty in developing highly coordinated cumulative research efforts could be attributed to the inadequacy of the dissemination of information to the educational research community regarding the findings of completed research and the nature of current research....Third, a careful examination of the outcomes of research in terms of service to the schools revealed that in two senses insufficient attention was being paid to the gap between the research stage and implementation. First, the state of development was not being supported to anything near the degree that it should. Second, very little attention was being directed to the change process whereby improvements could actually be implemented in wide-spread fashion. Third, it was clear that the human resources available for research and development activities would need to be expanded in at least two ways. Training programs to develop new talent would be required. New agencies and institutions previously not eligible for support would need to be tapped."

The amendments to the Cooperative Research Act made by Title IV of ESEA were designed to correct some of these deficiencies. Dissemination was specifically named as a function to be supported; the range of institutions eligible to apply for funds was expanded to include virtually all kinds of public and private institutions; authority to train researchers was added; and the use of the grant as well as contract mechanism was allowed. Finally, $100 million was authorized for constructing and equipping regional and national facilities for research and related purposes.

The combination of these new authorities enabled the Office to initiate a new program designed to "bridge the gap" between research and practice. The program of Regional Educational Laboratories would "translate" and "convert" the results of research into "useable forms" in the classroom. Then Commissioner Keppel, in testimony to the Congress prior to the passage of ESEA, specifically enunciated this objective:

"The proposed system of large-scale regional educational laboratories would provide the funds and the setting for the articulation of the results of research into forms that can be used in the classroom for continuous testing of these forms, for the training of teachers in their use, and for making them available to local school systems."

The decision to launch a series of new institutions to "bridge the gap" was in itself a decision to do something about 'relationship.' The following statement appears in an early policy paper (October, 1965) entitled "Programs for the Implementation of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965":

"New organizational arrangements are needed which will require the interaction of groups which have been concerned with different phases of the innovative process and/or different aspects of the educational process. No existing institutions have been able to

concern themselves with the total process because of the limitations of the separate organizational purposes, resources, and talent. It is therefore necessary to create a new institution to forge these links."

A similar statement appears in another internal policy paper:

"The NPEL (National Program of Educational Laboratories) proposes to establish a series of new institutions, a network, if you will, to bring into alliance research interests, legally responsible interests, operationally responsible interest, industry, and other institutions to provide an environment for the production of research and development, and the dissemination and implementation of research-based innovations and findings."

In his article, "The National Program of Educational Laboratories[2], Hendrik Gideonse writes:

"Extremely little of what has been discovered in educational research has ever been made operational....To some extent, excessive compartmentalization of the educational system explains the tortoise-like pace; schools, universities, state departments of education, teacher education programs, and the public have found it difficult to work together productively. If we are to achieve imaginative, rapid, effective, and meaningful improvements in the nation's school, however, compartmentalization must give way to cooperation among these groups."

The Office of Education's administrators expressed essentially the same idea in a March 1967 series of questions and answers. Responding to the question "Why was the establishment of new institutions necessary? " they wrote:

"Existing institutions were not created for the primary purpose of making the results of research and innovation available to schools. This task had to compete with their other responsibilities. A new institution was needed which had this task as its primary concern. The laboratories provided such an institution and a setting for collaboration among all interests, to insure the commitment of all pertinent institutions; the involvement of a variety of political jurisdictions; and the combination of different disciplines."

And again in August 1967, the administering staff repeated its perception of the need for 'relationship' when it repeated one of its criteria for judging laboratories:

"A laboratory should have a government capable of relating to all segments of the educational community whose involvement would be necessary and desirable for contributing to the adoption by schools of anticipated inventions and developments."

While a conviction that new relationships were needed was a principal idea of the laboratory program, lengthy experience had shown that new institutions were necessary in order to carry an idea through the sequential stages of research, development, field testing, completion of revision cycles and through to wide implementation. To cite an example:

> "(Laboratories are) reflections of the conviction that it is not enough to do research; that research must be followed up by development projects which, having established the desired objectives whether curricular, instructional, organizational, professional, or technical then move to the development of solutions drawing upon the best that research has to offer. The laboratories have also been charged with the responsibility for active dissemination campaigns based on the successful development projects they and others engage in."

In some papers and articles, this second premise, while not spelled out *per se*, is clearly inferred from the statements which define the appropriate functions which laboratories should assume in the research continuum. Almost all early policy papers announce that the laboratory program will be engaged in a "wide spectrum" of activities, and the authors go on to list almost all of the activities on the research to utilization continuum as appropriate for laboratory attention. An article appearing in the Saturday Review[3], for example, includes the following statement:

> "In general, laboratories will be concerned with a wide spectrum of activities such as basic and applied research, curriculum development and evaluation, demonstration programs, clearinghouse operations for research and curriculum materials, as well as training and dissemination."

Mr. Keppel's testimony also proposes the idea of comprehensiveness. He says:

> "The broad scope of the laboratories, being multi-disciplinary and concerned with research, development, training, retraining, and dissemination, will make interuniversity consortia arrangements highly desirable and provide for greater staffing strength. The same reasoning would apply to state departments of education or interstate regional educational organizations."

As Mr. Keppel's statement also makes clear, the two underlying premises discussed above were not unrelated. Activities such as dissemination and training would demand that laboratories establish cooperative relationships with other agencies; "comprehensiveness" would demand "relationship."

The Washington officials, the scholars and the educators who wrote about the laboratory program in its earliest stages underlined the need for a new institution which once launched would perform functions neglected by the educational system and thus hasten the process of quality educational change. Each laboratory was expected to define its unique role in its region, but it was also expected to work with and through the region's

schools, institutions of higher education, state departments and other groups in the conduct of its work.

The 1967 Minear study revealed that, to some extent at least, a "new partnership" was indeed emerging.

REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND THE QUEST FOR RELATIONSHIPS

The Idea of Development

The framers of the laboratory concept viewed the pursuit of "relationship" as a means to an end. In short, they reasoned that new relationships would forge the links whereby innovations would find their way into operating educational programs. The goal was not relationship *per se*; it was installation, or educational change.

Fostered by the repeated messages from the Office of Education to groups in the field trying to write prospectuses acceptable to USOE, the idea of relationship somehow became an end in itself. If USOE wanted a "new mix," apparently decided many of the groups, that was what they would get. Thus, without adequate consideration of the reasons for creating a "new mix," the purposes it would serve, or, once forged, the work it would pursue, many developing laboratory groups began to enunciate "relationship" as one of their primary functions. Operationalized, "relationship" became service, and many groups proposed to use some or even most of their funds to provide service to other institutions in the region. Service would be their mission and program.

Laboratories oriented toward regional relationships and service, however, were only one kind of developing laboratory. A second kind, and one which received more sympathetic hearing from USOE administrators and advisory groups, was product-oriented. These laboratories, unlike the "relationship laboratories," emerged from the first months of institution-building with plans for launching programs which would produce new products that could be used in schools. While "relationship laboratories" were arguing with skeptical USOE officials about the necessity for area offices throughout their regions to enable them to communicate with their constituencies, laboratories that had produced more concrete plans for product development received the more encouraging and approving feedback.

In January 1967, Dr. Francis Chase addressed the laboratory directors at a meeting in New Orleans. Dr. Chase, former Dean of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, had undertaken a study of the Laboratory Program the month before at the request of Commissioner Harold Howe II and Secretary John Gardner. The purpose of the study was to provide policy guidance to the Office and the Department regarding the National Program of Educational Laboratories, especially in light of the criticisms which had been directed at the program from the field and from different levels and offices within the Federal government. Since one immediate result of the decision to launch the Chase study had been the postponement for three months of contract negotiations for beginning operations, the laboratory directors were an especially attentive and anxious audience to Dr. Chase's first public address.

The vision that Dr. Chase shared for the future of the regional laboratories was not unlike the vision of the Gardner Task Force and other early thinkers.

Certainly, the vision included the idea of "relationship":

> "The laboratories might provide the new elements to make the American educational enterprise operate more nearly as a system of reciprocating parts. The public and non-public school systems, the several institutions of higher education, the state departments of education, and voluntary educational agencies of many kinds now function largely as discrete units which engage with each other intermittently or incidentally. The laboratories might be designed to mesh continuously both with the producers of theory and research and the potential consumers who are responsible for instruction and the operation of educational agencies. If so, the contribution to the effective functioning of other educational agencies would be incalculable."[4]

At the same time, however, Dr. Chase cautioned the New Orleans audience that the vision was not enough; something more was needed.

> "Until there is a set of communicable concepts or descriptive terms which are shared by and acted upon by the responsible government officials, the staff of the Office of Education, the boards and staffs of the several laboratories, and the agencies and persons with which they need to work, there is a danger that the laboratories may be seen as intruding on the jurisdictions of other agencies and/or as institutions so poorly defined as to be innocuous."[5]

What that something more might be--development--was suggested by Dr. Chase's cautionary plea that the laboratories not become "simply another educational agency functioning on the basis of opinion and the 'conventional wisdom' derived from experience."[6]

> "The indispensible prerequisite for both training and service activities is the development of tested technologies and specialized staff competence."[7]

What that something more should <u>not</u> be was suggested by remarks such as these:

> "I am...inclined to think that several laboratories are engaging in dubious activities and have become the prisoners of mistaken concepts of regionality, of self-defeating attempts to address themselves to everyone's perceptions of needs, and of 'entangling alliances' of various kinds."[8]

> "Two kinds of perceptions of what is expected seem to have produced effects that are dubious, if not downright damaging to the effective development of the laboratories. The first is that the program should represent a response to the needs of the region as ascertained from the persons concerned. Related to this is the perception that the laboratories will be judged by the number and diversity of

occupations of the persons involved. Both of these have contributed to the diffuseness which is found in the programs of many of the laboratories....It is my conviction that the laboratories must establish themselves by what they demonstrate, not by whom they involve. Widespread involvement of persons and agencies is no substitute for the development of soundly conceived and carefully developed efforts to produce understanding of how improvement in education can be achieved."[9]

Along with the transition by USOE personnel from an emphasis on "relationship" to an emphasis on program specificity (a transition which the passage of time and institution-building perhaps made more or less inevitable), along with Dr. Chase's influential predisposition towards the appropriateness of the laboratories for the development function, the emergence of "development" as the communicable concept which Dr. Chase had called for was also hastened by the increasing awareness that funds available to the national program would not support the twenty developing institutions in the large amounts which they had first been led to believe. The realities of a tight fiscal year forced directors and boards to make choices. By fiscal year 1968 it was more than apparent that the dollar rewards were going to those laboratories that were oriented toward developmental programs with product outputs. Although "relationship" might still be important in some laboratories, and though it might prove to be important to product-oriented laboratories when, at some time in the future, they were ready to install their products on a widespread basis, it had ceased to be the program's dominant idea.

Kjell Eide, Director of Research and Planning for the Norwegian Ministry of Education, who assisted Dr. Chase during the early summer of 1967 by studying the laboratories' planning processes, reflected on the changes this way:

"...Most lab programs are moving towards a more narrow range of activities. They may partly be due to USOE signals, and partly a matter of less resources than initially foreseen. In the majority of laboratories, both planned research and service activities have been reduced, in some cases to a drastic extent. Development, field testing, and possible demonstration seem to be the most favored lab activities more recently. This may be viewed as a natural consequence of the reduced university influence on lab policies, and the gradual development of inhouse competence within the labs."[10]

"The recent development towards more concentrated programs has led to unquestionable gains in terms of stronger lab institutions, more capable of controlling their own programs. Current programs are also by and large more compatible with available resources, although most labs still have programs presupposing a higher funding level in the future. Some real losses, however, should be recognized as a result of the narrowing down of program scope, in terms of reduced local involvement and interest in lab activities in quite a few cases."[11]

Eide felt, nevertheless, that "the question as to whether the educational laboratories can form the institutional base for a new developmental

function within education" must in his view be given an affirmative answer.[12] The conclusion of his report is also an affirmative one:

> "A substantial part of the difficulties faced by the laboratories today is due to their operating far below their optimal scale. In my judgment, most of the laboratories have by now reached a state which permits a rapid expansion of their resources. If a continuous and fairly rapid growth in the resources available to the laboratories should not be forthcoming in the next couple years, much of the present promise of the lab program will not be fulfilled. The task I have assumed to be the basic objective of the lab program is not by far an easy one, and cannot be achieved at the present level of effort."[13]

Unfortunately, a continuous and fairly rapid growth in the resources available to the laboratories has not been forthcoming as Eide hoped.

The final report which Dr. Chase prepared on his study was issued in December 1968, almost two years after the New Orleans debut. In those two years, Dr. Chase visited each of the twenty regional laboratories and the nine Research and Development Centers one or more times, conversed on numerous occasions with USOE and other government personnel, served as chairman of a National Advisory Council of Educational Laboratories, consulted with experts who, at his request, visited some of the institutions, and reviewed early documents and current materials, including the previously elusive Presidential Task Force report which was the source of many of the ideas later incorporated into ESEA and the laboratory concept. Explaining his method he says, "At every opportunity I communicated my tentative impressions and stimulated conversations to test my impressions against the experience and judgment of other observers and of those actively engaged in shaping and administering the new organizations."[14]

Given this background, it is especially interesting to note some of the points made in the final report. Looking back at the laboratories, for example, Dr. Chase remarks:

> "The concepts which led to their founding were powerful, but vague; and incorporated differentiated, and not always mutually consistent, perceptions of roles and functions. As a result, the centers and laboratories often had difficulty in defining their primary functions and identifying the particular expectations to which they can respond appropriately."[15]

Looking at the present, he sees that:

> "All of the laboratories now conceive their functions in terms of development of tested products, operable systems, or other demonstrably useful contributions to the improvement of educational institutions and processes; but each laboratory has unique characteristics and some distinct types of orientation have evolved."[16]

The three types of orientations he identifies are (1) product development, (2) regional development, and (3) orientation to a closely defined set of

problems, and "The remaining laboratories appear to fall more or less into what might be called a fourth category of development-through-training."[17]

Looking at the laboratories' promise to produce change in American education, Dr. Chase says:

> "The laboratories are making significant contributions to many of the processes discussed. They seem better adapted than most university centers to widespread diffusion of tested innovations and systems through collaborative relationships with schools, colleges, and other agencies; and they are devising strategies to promote installation, effective use, and continuing evaluation."[18]

The report closes with five conclusions, presented below.

> "The National Program of Educational Laboratories is evolving into a functioning system with demonstrated power, and great potential, for the improvement of American education."
>
> "The modest investment in the laboratories and centers already has produced good returns and revealed possibilities for increasing the returns from all educational expenditures."
>
> "The best way to realize continuing and enlarged gains from educational research and development is to conserve and build upon the strength that has been developed by the centers and laboratories which have shown that they can produce and which are making the greatest progress in improving their operations."
>
> "Several matters require prompt attention in order to realize the full potential of center and laboratory types of organizations and reform of educational institutions and practices."
>
> "Successful research and development in education is, and will continue to be, both a science and an art; and qualitative assessments often are more relevant than quantitative measurements."[19]

Competing Expectations

Throughout the duration of the Chase study, and still today, the idea of relationship, though faded, was still alive. Contracts between the Office of Education and each regional laboratory include the following agreement, uniformly, in their current Scope of Work:

> "The laboratory will maintain cooperative and productive working relationships with State Departments of Education, educational institutions of all levels, and other groups in the region and the nation which are relevant to the programs of the laboratory including, if appropriate, the development of jointly planned and financed program activities."

By the time the Chase study was released, the idea of development had become entrenched in the descriptive language and had achieved predominance. In September 1968, for example, Commissioner Howe responded in memorandum to a proposal from the HEW Budget Office regarding new ways of making decisions about the amounts of laboratory support. The HEW suggestions--that laboratories receive a minimum level of funding adequate to support the institution and then compete with each other and others for support for individual programs--evoked this response:

> "The Office is committed through consideration of these alternative funding strategies to locate those which will insure the laboratories' commitment to educational development as their functional mission (in contrast to research or service), their commitment to insure that their region's schools and colleges benefit from the products and practices developed by the entire National Program, and their commitment to a management known for its design and development skills as contrasted to its entrepreneural skills."[20]

The HEW Budget Office was not alone. A study by Rivlin of the HEW Office of Planning and Evaluation and papers coming from the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) revealed both less faith and less understanding of the Laboratory Program than those actively involved with the Program might have hoped. The PSAC review, for instance, questioned the quality of laboratory personnel in particular and expressed a perception of the need for much more basic research in education.

The views of the Budget Office, the PSAC committee and the Department Planning Office could not be ignored, for within the complex and sometimes subtle machinery by which government makes decisions, the views of these groups could, and can, profoundly affect the Laboratory Program's future. In November 1968, the Bureau of Research's response to their criticisms included the statements below: (Shortly thereafter, a fairly lengthy rebuttal to the August PSAC paper was prepared which questioned the adequacy of the committee's exposure to the institutions, answered all criticisms, and called attention to logical inconsistencies.)

> "Recommendations were expressly made in Rivlin's study and implied in several places in the PSAC Task Group's report that laboratories should compete for program support and, further, that each laboratory cooperate with OE to establish its mission. As for the last point, this is exactly what is now and has been taking place for the last eighteen months. Since May of 1967 the laboratories, OE staff, and the National Advisory Committee on Educational Laboratories have been working together to define specific missions which will insure that the program as a whole is directed toward educational problems of national priority."

> "...We see the laboratories as participating actively in the first stages of the diffusion process. This includes providing support for credible demonstrations and devising strategies for involving those who have to be involved if a validated innovation is to be widely diffused throughout the educational system."[21]

It is telling to note the new emphases in these remarks. Now the development function is not being defended so much as the laboratories' attention to "educational problems of national priority." Now "bridging the gap" is giving way to "participation in the first stages of the diffusion process" which includes "involving those who have to be involved." Needless to say, development can be directed at national priorities, and institutions bridge the gap while participating in diffusion. But, the language had changed to suit a new requirement. More important, the Laboratory Program seems to have suffered repeatedly from these kinds of changing emphases and competing expectations.

One more example of this point is relevant. In December 1967, a report was published of a study of the Office of Education by the House Committee on Education and Labor. One of the recommendations on which the Office was asked to comment was the following:

> "Immediate attention should be given to a clarification of the missions and responsibilities of the regional educational laboratories, the R&D Centers, the Title III (ESEA) supplementary centers, the research coordinating units in State educational agencies, and other federally supported regional units which affect education. Every effort should be made to achieve maximum cooperation and to avoid duplication of effort."

Another recommendation was "The Bureau should strengthen and expand communications with the elementary and secondary education community, particularly with State Departments of Education..."[22]

The response that was sent forward from the Associate Commissioner of Research to the next level of OE hierarchy in February 1968--over a year into the Chase study--could hardly have assuaged the Green Committee's doubts; furthermore, as it appears below, the statement appears to be a particularly good example of those that create confusing expectations and long-term difficulties in the service of more immediate tactical defense.

> "The primary responsibilities of the Regional Educational Laboratories and the R&D Centers are the actual development of new materials or techniques for use in the classroom for the training of teachers, the training of administrators or other major problems of education....There is considerable overlap in the function of the regional laboratories and the R&D Centers. However, usually the R&D Centers will have a greater emphasis on the research end of the spectrum and the regional laboratories will have a greater emphasis on the demonstration end. Both, however, are very active in the development of new materials and techniques. Really the support of these organizations is an experiment in itself to see which type of organization is more productive in this particular objective."[23]

Perhaps all government programs suffer many masters. Certainly, many programs, including the Laboratory Program, may serve more than one purpose, may be described in more than one way, and may reflect in their various instances (e.g., projects, classes, institutions) an acceptable range of variability.

However, if each instance is expected to serve all purposes and to be capable of description in all ways, the financial consequences to the government are large ones. With less than optimal funding, someone has to make choices. So far, the laboratories have primarily exercised that responsibility, and for the most part they have chosen to put their energies where the Office, and the various levels of government to which it must answer, has been willing to put its funds.

In a letter to the director of the Laboratory Branch, USOE, one of the laboratory directors addressed the problem the Office now faces in deciding about funding among the different research and development functions:

> "It seems clear there is a wide range in the self-concept of laboratories. Some are almost totally engaged in "product" and "process" development, without much concern for "installation," while others are devoting most of their energies to "creating climates" conducive to change. Since both of these purposes must be served by each laboratory if its products are to be installed, or if it is to have products to install, it would appear that individual laboratory fundings might well be related to the extent to which both functions are being performed."[24]

This suggestion would, of course, be one alternative, although it seems to overlook the fact that product development and widespread installation usually occur in a time sequence. The comment is perhaps more interesting insofar as it raises the "relationship development" duality quite plainly. Clearly, the conflict by this time, if it remains a conflict, deserves to be put to rest. What does the Office of Education want to support? If it wants both relationship (or installation) and development, is it willing and able to bear that cost: An evaluation of the financial scene made by Dr. Chase in his Final Report is equally true now, he says that the funds committed to the laboratory and center programs are:

> "utterly inadequate for the support of anything approaching a major research and development operation in a field as complex as education, which in one way or another involves not merely the one-fourth of the population engaged in formal schooling, but in actual effect the total society."[25]

The Present Context

This report has attempted to establish the historical and ideological context within which this study of relationships between regional laboratories and other educational agencies must be viewed. That the ideas have not always been clear or consistent must in itself have been an important influence affecting the formation and promise of many of the relationships that developed. The historical review also suggests at least one implication for the future of the laboratory program: namely, that in the absence of clear cut expectations, pragmatic considerations will dictate the nature of the relationships that laboratories seek to establish.

It may be helpful to complete the description of the general context within which the results of the study must be placed. For example, it is relevant to know that regional educational laboratories, after colleges and universities, are the second largest group of performers of educational research and development in the United States,[26] and that since their establishment, they have substantially increased the number of professional personnel engaged in educational R&D on a full-time basis in this country. (Laboratory staffs currently number about 2000.) The sections below regarding state involvement in research and development and the current indecision about the importance of regionality present two additional aspects.

State Involvement in Educational Research and Development

State education agencies may be classified among the country's sponsors of educational R&D. In fiscal year 1968, $3,299,000 was spent by state education agencies in the support of educational research, $2,666,000 of which came via the U.S. Office of Education. (The same fiscal year, the Office supported the twenty regional laboratories at a level of $22,793,000, and the nation's total expenditure for educational R&D constituted 31/100 of 1 percent of the nation's total educational expenditure.)[27]

The degree of state involvement with educational R&D varies. In some states regular legislative appropriations are designated for research activities; in some states, the regular research budget is covered by a line item in a lump sum departmental appropriation. In some states, research programs in particular areas have been initiated in response to legislative mandates and then later broadened from specific to general routine support of research.

Not only do almost all states support education research in some degree, but in many cases, state departments of education provide leadership in the coordination of educational research for programs under their jurisdiction. "Departmental research divisions in the states function in a service capacity to the department as a whole. They may also play important roles in sponsoring or cooperating with state educational research councils, school study councils, or other governmental or independent organizations involved in stimulating and otherwise encouraging educational research activities."[28]

Reflecting on the role of state departments of education in educational R&D and the process of educational change, Dr. Francis Chase expressed the position that:

> "State departments of education through consulting services, accreditation processes, and otherwise, play an indispensable part in the diffusion of tested technologies and systems; but they are not well adapted to the conduct of extensive problem-oriented research or the translation of such research into developmental products."[29]

The data gathered by this study appear to support Dr. Chase's position; the state departments queried did not see themselves as having the responsibility for developmental products, although they most clearly did accept the responsibility for diffusion of such products once developed. Thus, state

"involvement" in educational research and development largely signifies different working activities than those of regional laboratories, and laboratories and state departments can play mutually complementary roles in the change process. These two conclusions are consistent with and would seem to be further supported by the statement below currently defining the mission of the regional laboratories. First used in 1967, the language appeared most recently in the July 1969 Bureau of Research publication, Educational Research and Development in the United States.

> "The mission of the program of regional educational laboratories is to speed the intelligent application and widespread utilization of the results of educational research and development. The over-all objective of the program is to create and demonstrate a rich array of tested alternatives to existing educational practice, leaving choice regarding adoption or adaptation of these alternatives in the hands of State and local educational agencies."[30]

Regionality

The concept of "regionality" was one of the earliest and most controversial guiding ideas of the Laboratory Program. Without reiterating the arguments pro and con, suffice it to say that twenty laboratories were established which in some way served, worked with, or involved individuals and institutions in all the states.

It is obvious that the concept of regionality is related to that of "relationship." Regional affiliations, institutional membership, and representation of key and varied educational leadership on laboratory governing boards would give the laboratories needed entrees to sources of talent, sites for field tryout, ready acceptance for installation of laboratory products, and other advantages without which the laboratories could not hope to operate. In many ways, a laboratory's so-called region was to define the boundaries within which it would confine its assorted relationships.

When the Chase study focused on the question of regionality, it concluded that a distributed national network was developing which was operating from a local or regional base but which was serving national purposes and producing national impact. Dr. Chase voiced the position that it was desirable to have laboratories in the major regions of the country but that no special validity was attached to the regional groupings then existing.

In the fall of 1968, due to budgetary limitations, the Office of Education announced its intention to withdraw support from five of the twenty laboratories as of August 1969. These terminations seriously undermine the concept of regionality of laboratories. As USOE's Laboratory Branch Director noted, "The Office either has to redefine the 20 regions so they become 15 or drop the descriptor and assess the changes in laboratory governance and management which might follow as a consequence."[31] (The fact that several laboratories have established working relationships with schools and other educational agencies outside their regions further threatens the original concept.)

If USOE or the several laboratories ignore the consequences of the termination actions and fail to follow one of these courses, one immediate effect may be the exclusion of several states from the benefits accruing to others by virtue of their participation in and relationship to individual laboratories. Government administrators might well review their words of April 1965, in response to an inquiry by the Senate Education Subcommittee. As quoted in the Senate Minority Report on Title IV, ESEA, HEW went on record saying:

> "The committee may be assured that in the administration of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Office of Education will continue to be guided by the requirement that regional laboratories should be geographically distributed in an equitable manner (taking into account population factors) so as to serve all areas of the United States."[32]

Summary

To summarize, several conditions have affected the formation and promise of the various types of relationships that have developed between regional laboratories, local school systems, state education agencies and other educational groups. Historically, the importance attached to the idea of relationship, the importance subsequently attached to the laboratories engaging in the development function, and the ebb and flow between these two emphases and others were all forces impinging on laboratory development, each with different consequences for the nature and strength of potential relationships. Other conditions were, and are, the fact of growing state involvement in educational R&D, and the presently changing concept of the regionality of educational laboratories.

Still another condition affecting the formation of relationships is inherent in the R&D enterprise itself. Dr. Chase expressed it in this way:

> "Research and development agencies by their nature intervene in systems which they do not control...The centers and laboratories are finding it necessary to reconsider periodically their choice of intervention strategies and the application of the strategies to decisions on (a) scope and sequence of activities, (b) persons and agencies to be involved in various phases and stages, and (c) tactics to be employed in initiating and reinforcing constructive change."[33]

Finally, the inability of the Office of Education, despite the history and experience it has by now accumulated in managing the Laboratory Program, to resolve in its own mind many of the questions which this discussion has touched upon is a condition that cannot help but influence all phases of laboratory operations. It must be disconcerting and disheartening to the fifteen laboratories now engaged in developmental program activities to come across the following statement in a public volume, which, by the way, notes in another place the laboratories' "rather substantial impact" in disseminating R&D information. The statement appears in a discussion about the Bureau of Research strategy for managing R&D support programs.

"A second activity which has absorbed a major portion of the Bureau's energies has centered on the instrumentalities the Bureau has identified, created, or used to carry out its several missions. The kinds of questions which have been raised and discussed are: (1) the role of the educational laboratories and R&D Centers; (2) the manner in which they are supported; (3) the degree to which such forms of programmatic or institution support are compatible with the identification and service of substantive educational research and development priorities; and (4) the need to create such institutions to build capabilities which would not otherwise exist in the Nation. These issues are nearer solution than previously since they have been forcefully raised and are now being actively debated. Bureau and other USOE and DHEW officials admit to the complexity of the problems which are involved, but they are all committed to making substantial progress toward their resolution."[34]

The Nature of Possible Relationships

Each of two recently completed studies makes note of laboratory relationships with other educational agencies. Insofar as their observations are relevant to the purposes of this study, they are presented below.

First, Robert Mager, as a result of a study of teacher training projects of the regional laboratories, comes to a conclusion suggested here earlier; namely, that pragmatic considerations determine laboratory relationships. In his words:

"As indicated in our discussion of dissemination, laboratories are cooperating with a significant number of agencies--schools, centers, state departments of education, citizen groups and others. That their cooperation with other laboratories at this moment is limited should only be interpreted to mean that other laboratories are not seen as relevant to the immediate success of a given project."[35]

Second, the comprehensive Bureau of Research document Educational Research and Development in the United States also notes a breadth and effectiveness of laboratory relationships. The volume reports on a special survey to determine the sources of information which school superintendents use to keep informed about educational R&D. One finding was that printed materials are far less popular sources of knowledge than word of mouth. Another finding, more particularly related to the subject of this study, was this:

"While across all districts the number reporting extensive use of AERA publications and ERIC was 1.2 percent and 2 percent, respectively, the data reporting some use of varying dissemination means indicate that both ERIC and particularly the regional laboratories are having a rather substantial impact, given the short period of time (three years from inception, two years of full-scale operation) they have been in existence."[36]

Sixty-eight percent of the districts responding to the survey reported some use of the laboratories as a source of information about R&D.

For the purposes of this study, however, it is not enough to accept the very general conclusions that laboratories are cooperating with other educational agencies, or that laboratories are serving effectively as dissemination agents. "With which agencies are they cooperating?" and "What would be the more or less 'ideal' patterns of relationship with that agency?" are equally important questions.

For several reasons, this study focused on laboratory relationships with one particular group of educational agencies--state departments of education. First, even the most casual acquaintance with the Laboratory Program indicates that laboratories are actively cooperating with schools; their developmental programs demand it. Second, if the laboratories' products are ultimately to find their way into the schools of the laboratory's region, in many cases the products will have to pass state scrutiny and receive state endorsement and approval prior to state-wide adoption. Third, if laboratories' products are to be installed in a larger area than the laboratory's immediate regional base, mechanisms will be necessary to maintain a complex communication network between individual laboratories and all states. Fourth, the fears of those who see the laboratories as a threat to State control of education ought to be acknowledged and tested. Fifth, state education departments have changed and strengthened since the beginnings of the Laboratory Program by virtue of the infusion of funds and personnel.

For all these reasons, it seems clear that laboratories should have established some relationships with state departments and that the relationships should be "good" ones. More specifically, we propose the items below as indicative of those behaviors or kinds of relationships which laboratories ideally should by now have fostered with the various state education departments.

1. State departments in a laboratory's region should be able to demonstrate a knowledge of that laboratory's development programs.

2. State departments of education throughout the country should be able to demonstrate knowledge about the Laboratory Program and about the development programs of each of the individual laboratories.

3. State departments of education should be supportive of educational research and development; such supportiveness should include a knowledge of what educational research and development is, a knowledge of the role of state departments in the process, and a conviction that R&D is an important activity for educational change and an essential one for educational improvement.

4. State departments should be willing to express public support for the Laboratory Program and work for its continuance.

5. State departments should be willing to invest financially in the substantive work of a laboratory, to enter into joint financial agreements of other kinds, and to cooperate with laboratories in other ways where laboratories bear the cost of the particular effort.

6. State departments should be involved by the laboratories in program planning and program implementation, in the determination of laboratory policy, and in the dissemination-installation phase of laboratory activities.

This study, it should be noted, evidences that among the five laboratories and nineteen state departments studied the actual relationships at this time fall far short of the ideal-type presented above. State departments, on the whole, may know something about the laboratory in their region but typically know little or nothing about other laboratories. In only a few cases do state departments feel that they have been meaningfully involved in the planning and implementation of laboratory work.

FOOTNOTES

1. R. Louis Bright and Hendrik Gideonse, Research, Development, and Dissemination Strategies in Improving Education, mimeographed, 1967.

2. Phi Delta Kappan, November 1965.

3. Saturday Review of Literature, Barbara McNeill and Fritz Ianni, Organizing for Continual Change, pgs. 55-56, June 19, 1956.

4. Francis S. Chase, The National Program of Educational Laboratories: Report of a Study of Twenty Educational Laboratories and Nine Research and Development Centers, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois: December 1968, pp. 83-4.

5. ibid., p. 85.

6. ibid., p. 88.

7. ibid., p. 88.

8. ibid., p. 81.

9. ibid., pp. 86-7.

10. ibid., p. 100.

11. ibid., pp. 101-2.

12. ibid., p. 94.

13. ibid., p. 113.

14. ibid., p. 3.

15. ibid., p. 6.

16. ibid., p. 37.

17. ibid., p. 39.

18. ibid., p. 28.

19. ibid., p. 62 ff.

20. Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education, to William Kelly, Memorandum, September 1968.

21. Bureau of Research, November 1968.

22. Study of the United States Office of Education, 90th Congress, 1st Session, House Document no. 193, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1967.

23. R. Louis Bright, Associate Commissioner for Research, to Robert Kane, Special Assistant for Management Information, Memorandum, February 29, 1968.

24. Everett Hopkins, Director, Regional Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia to Richard A. McCann, Director, Laboratory Branch.

25. Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

26. Bureau of Research, Office of Education: Educational Research and Development in the United States, July 1969, p. 93.

27. The information contained in this section is derived from Educational Research and Development in the United States, Bureau of Research, Office of Education, July 1969, pp. 78-80.

28. ibid., p. 80.

29. Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

30. Bureau of Research, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

31. Richard A. McCann, Director, Laboratory Branch, to files, Memorandum, January 1969.

32. Senate Report 146 - to accompany HR 2362, 89th Congress, 1st Session; Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Page 31.

33. Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

34. Bureau of Research, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

35. Robert Mager, Teacher Training Projects of the Regional Educational Laboratories, September 1, 1969.

36. Bureau of Research, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

APPENDIX B

CASE STUDY OF EMERGING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND RELATED STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES UNDER CONTRACT WITH U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

July 1969

INTRODUCTION

This survey is concerned with two general questions:

One, what can be done to facilitate the development of instructional procedures and materials which will be more effective and less expensive than present materials and procedures? For example, how can we reduce the time it takes and the amount it costs to teach students to read or to do arithmetic?

Two, how can we shorten the time between the development of a new educational product and its actual adoption and use by classroom teachers?

With respect to both of these questions we want to get a clearer picture of both the obstacles to development and diffusion of better educational procedures and of successful strategies that have been developed for overcoming these obstacles.

An analysis of the way the laboratories work shows that most go through the following steps as they work on programs to develop new curricula, to design and develop new teaching and school organization methods, and to design and develop new systems. As they go through these phases of their work, they do perform these steps alone or they may work with others on some or all phases.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Problem identification

   a. From your point of view, as a member of a State Department of Education (or as a member of an Educational Laboratory) who has the responsibility for identifying the critical problems of education in your state or region?

   b. Who ought to have that responsibility?

   c. From your point of view, what are the critical educational problems in this state (or region)?

2. Establishing priorities

   a. Once the critical problems facing education in your state or region have been identified, who has the responsibilities for establishing priorities--for actually committing money, personnel and other resources, and for initiating work on the problem?

   b. Who ought to have that responsibility?

   c. Have you taken such responsibility lately? If so, could you give me a brief description of what you did, and the outcomes of your actions?

3. Initiating work

   a. After an educational problem has been identified and assigned a priority, who has the responsibility for doing a feasibility study of existing alternatives--finding out whether people in other parts of the country have developed solutions or ways of dealing with this problem which could either be adopted or modified for use here.

   b. Who ought to have that responsibility?

   c. Have you made a feasibility study recently? If yes, could you describe it briefly.

4. Specifications

   a. Who has the responsibility for the development of specifications for any new product or program that is needed? For example, suppose it was decided that a better method of teaching remedial reading was needed and that a set of reading materials should be developed that would provide information about any given student's current level of ability, the kinds of mistakes he makes, etc. as

well as providing corrective exercises, that these remedial materials should be suitable for students ranging in age from 8 to 16, etc. Who should make the decisions about such specifications?

b. Who ought to have that responsibility?

c. Have you been involved in such activities during the past five years? If so, describe briefly.

5. Utilization

a. Once the specifications for a new educational product have been decided upon, who has the responsibility for planning a system for effective utilization? In other words, who is responsible for planning what must be done? In other words, who is responsible for planning what will be done in order to get that product into the teacher training institutions and into the schools themselves?

b. Who should be responsible?

c. Have you been actively engaged in such activities during the past five years?

6. Feedback planning

a. Who is responsible for establishing preliminary plans for feedback and impact studies, for planning ways of getting information about the extent to which the product will be used in teacher training and measure impact when it is actually used in the schools?

b. Who should be responsible?

c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

7. Development

a. Once the planning described above has been completed, who has the responsibility for developing a new product? Who has the responsibility for putting together in its preliminary form the first crude model of say a new test, or teaching device?

b. Who should have this responsibility?

c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

8. Test revision cycle

   a. After a preliminary model of a new product is available--say a test or instructional program--who is responsible for the test revision cycle--for trying the product out on small groups of students, getting information about whether the students reacted in the hoped for way in order to know how the product needs to be changed, correcting the product and then trying it out on another group of students, and repeating this cycle until it has been demonstrated that the product is working well?

   b. Who should be responsible?

   c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

9. Planning teacher training

   a. When step 8 has been completed, who has the responsibility for developing a plan for teaching teachers or other personnel how to use the product?

   b. Who should be responsible?

   c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

10. Implementing teacher training

   a. Who has the responsibility for putting the teacher training plans developed in step 9 into action?

   b. Who should be responsible?

   c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

11. Information to potential users

   a. After a new product has been perfected, who has the responsibility for informing potential users at various levels of the availability of that product?

   b. Who should be responsible?

   c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

12. Insuring use

   a. Who has the responsibility of getting the product into use and into the hands of teachers on the job and insuring that they actually use it?

b. Who should be responsible?

c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

13. Data feedback and evaluation

a. Who has the responsibility for feedback and evaluation of result of use of the product?

b. Who should be responsible?

c. Have you been engaged in any such activities during the past five years? If so, please describe them briefly.

14. Optional final question

a. Could you identify one or two of the more exciting efforts which you worked on in the past five years. This could be a program involving curriculum development, building design, special teacher training or any other innovative idea which either was introduced or ultimately was not used.

b. Could you indicate the forces which were supportive of the idea such as public support, teacher support or others.

c. Could you indicate the forces which, in your opinion, were obstacles or road blocks to successful implementation or introduction of the program or which created delay.